

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Reexamination of the captioned application is respectfully requested.

#### **A. SUMMARY OF THIS RESPONSE**

By the current response, Applicants basically:

1. Thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 17, 19, 52-53, 70 and 72.
2. Thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 5, 10-11, 13-15, 48-49, 58, 63-64 and 66-67.
3. Amend independent claims 7, 46, and 60.
4. Amend dependent claims 13, 15, 50, 51, 68, 69, 91, and 92 for sake of consistency with amended independent claim 7, 46, and 60.
5. Respectfully traverse all prior art rejections.

#### **B. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS**

Claims 2-3, 7, 60, 55-56, 59 and 68-69 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/30056 to Salmela in view of U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand et al. Claims 4, 8-9, 12, 43-47, 50-51, 57, 65 and 90-92 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/30056 to Salmela in view of U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand et al and further in view of GB 2315193 to Reynolds. Claims 87 and 89 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/30056 to Salmela in view of U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand et al and further in view of Background of the Invention. Claim 88 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over WO 98/30056 to Salmela in view of U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand et al and further in view of GB 2315193 to Reynolds and further in view of Background of the Invention.

## B. PATENTABILITY OF THE CLAIMS

All prior art rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Independent claims 7, 46, and 60 have been amended to emphasize what previously was clearly inferred: that user equipment unit makes its determination (whether the user equipment unit is eligible to operate or not operate in a cell) on a basis of an access group to which the user equipment unit belongs as indicated by access group classification information. The amendatory language is amply supported by the original disclosure, including (for example), the second sentence of paragraph [0024].

Independent claims 1, 42, and 54 have also been amended to refer to the “access group classification” as “access group classification information”, which has precedence and support in, e.g., the last sentence of paragraph [0062].

Both WO 98/30056 to Salmela and U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand require storage, at a mobile station, of some sort of list of cells in which the mobile station is permitted to operate. *See, e.g.*, the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6 of WO 98/30056 to Salmela and col. 7, lines 30 *et seq* of U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand. When traveling into a new cell, the mobile station must then compare an identifier broadcast by the new cell with the list of permitted cells to determine whether the mobile station is permitted to operate. *See, e.g.*, page 6, lines 7 *et seq* of WO 98/30056 to Salmela and col. 7, lines 30 *et seq* of U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand. In a situation in which the permitted cell list is stored in the mobile station via signaling through a radio access network, considerable signaling can be involved for transmitting the list and effecting the comparison.

By contrast, Applicants’ independent claims 7, 46, and 60 compare access group eligibility information (transmitted in an access group message) and access group classification information (the access group classification information is generated by a

core network node which classified the user equipment unit into at least one of plural access groups). The Office should not overlook the fact that Applicants' independent claims 7, 46, and 60 require a network to classify a user equipment unit in a group and appries the user equipment unit of access group classification information reflecting the access group to which it belongs. Classification of the user equipment unit in a group, and comparison of access group classification information to access group eligibility information, enables Applicants to avoid having to provide/store at the user equipment unit on an on-going basis a list of eligible cells. Instead, the user equipment unit can, upon entry into a new cell, listen to determine whether its access group is included in the eligibility information broadcast by the new cell.

Neither WO 98/30056 to Salmela nor U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand describe or contemplate the transmission of access group classification information or access group eligibility information. Both instead describe transmission of a list of individual cells. Although U.S. Patent 6,334,052 to Nordstrand does refer to a "subscriber group", such reference is only oblique and no subscriber group information is transmitted through the network. It appears from Nordstrand's description of "subscriber group" that such group is in the mind of the employer for the sake of its employee-subscribers. Whether a mobile station is able to access an "exclusive access cell" such as microcell 121 or 122 is determined by checking the subscription data for the user (*See*, e.g., col. 9, lines 52 – col. 10, lines 18, particularly col. 10, lines 11 – 18). Presumably each user's subscription data must be individually checked: there is no indication by Nordstrand that the employees are provided with classification information which associates them together as a group, or that any such group-identifying information is ever sent or provided to the Nordstrand mobile station.

In view of the deficiencies of the prior art rejections of independent claims 7, 46, and 60, these claims are deemed allowable over the applied prior art. The allowability of

the independent claims renders the dependent claims allowable as well. Various dependent claims have separate bases of patentable significance, some of which were elaborated in earlier responses. Applicants' previous remarks pertaining to both the independent claims and dependent claims are hereby incorporated and realleged.

Applicants specifically traverse allegations of the office action which allege that GB 2315193 to Philip Reynolds teaches or suggests a bitmap of any type. Philip never describes his forbidden list as a list, which is an enumeration of PLMN cell codes and not a bitmap. A bitmap is a recognized term in the art and cannot comprise a listing of codes. Applicants fail to see how steps 108 and 122 of Fig. 8 can be alleged to be bitmaps. A display of a service indicator (step 108) which identifies a public network is not a bitmap, nor is a display of another PLMN service indicator (step 122).

### **C. MISCELLANEOUS**

In view of the foregoing and other considerations, the Examiner has ample bases for withdrawing all rejections and for allowance of all pending claims. Accordingly, a formal indication of allowance is earnestly solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge the undersigned's deposit account #14-1140 in whatever amount is necessary for entry of these papers and the continued pendency of the captioned application.

Should the Examiner feel that an interview with the undersigned would facilitate allowance of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned.

HOGAN et al  
Serial No. 10/068,001

**Atty Dkt:** 2380-604  
**Art Unit:** 2684

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By:                     /H. Warren Burnam, Jr./                      
H. Warren Burnam, Jr.  
Reg. No. 29,366

HWB:lsh  
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor  
Arlington, VA 22203-1808  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100